



#8/Response

11/15/03
John H.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: M. Nandakumar et al. Examiner: Edgardo Ortiz
Serial No.: 09/876,292 Art Unit: 2815
Filed: 06/07/2001 Docket: TI-31089
For: ADDITIONAL N-TYPE LDD/POCKET IMPLANT FOR IMPROVING
SHORT-CHANNEL NMOS ESD ROBUSTNESS

AMENDMENT PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.115

VIA USPS EXPRESS MAIL
Mailing Label No. EV239818079US

Commissioner for Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV239818079US
Date of Deposit: December 26, 2002

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with
the U.S. Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"
under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date shown above and is addressed to
the Commissioner for Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C.
20231.

Ginger Cox

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of October 4, 2002, favorable reconsideration and allowance
of the application are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-11 for double patenting over the claims of U.S. 6,452,236 is
respectfully traversed, since the claims of the present application are in fact directed to an inventive
improvement over the claims of 6,452,236. Note specifically that present claim 1 includes the
following limitation not found in the prior patent:

"said shallow regions surrounded in part by an enhanced doping implant region of
the first conductivity type"

The purpose of this enhanced doping implant region is to increase the current gain of the parasitic
lateral bipolar transistor, in an ESD event, which initiates thermal breakdown, thereby improving
ESD robustness, as stated in the specification at page 5, lines 24-28.



Serial No. 09/876292
Attorney Docket TI-31089

The Office Action wrongly dismisses this improvement with the unsupported assertion that "it is a known practice to include doping implant regions surrounding lightly doped active regions . . . to suppress short-channel effect." The Examiner fails to cite any reference that would substantiate or clarify his opinion. However, even assuming the Examiner may be correct regarding the suppression of a "short-channel effect," it is still an irrelevant position.

Applicants have discovered a radically different purpose for the present enhanced doping implant region, not related to a "short-channel effect." Moreover, Applicants' added region is neither structurally nor functionally equivalent to any region previously used to suppress any short-channel effect, if there is any such prior art region (not cited).

Nothing in the prior art suggests Applicants' claimed improvement over U.S. 6,452,236. Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants now believe the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary C. Honeycutt
Reg. No. 20,250

Dated: December 26, 2002

Attorneys for Applicant
Godwin Gruber, P.C.
Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street, Suite 1700
Dallas, Texas 75270-2084
Phone - 214.939.8651
Fax - 214.760.7332

RECEIVED
JAN - 2 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800